



**You have downloaded a document from  
RE-BUS  
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

**Title:** Group adjectives, possessives and single-participant derived nominals in Polish

**Author:** Bożena Cetnarowska

**Citation style:** Cetnarowska Bożena. (2016). Group adjectives, possessives and single-participant derived nominals in Polish. "Questions and Answers in Linguistics" (Vol. 3, iss. 2 (2016), s. 27-39),doi 10.1515/qal-2016-0005



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI  
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka  
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki  
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

## Group adjectives, possessives and single-participant derived nominals in Polish

Bożena Cetnarowska

**ABSTRACT** The article compares the occurrence of pronominal possessive adjectives and denominal group adjectives in Polish event nominals. It is demonstrated that while in other Slavonic languages (e.g., in Russian) relational adjectives clearly contrast with possessive adjectives (both pronominal and lexical ones), in Polish denominal group adjectives, such as *prezydencki* ‘presidential’, *ministerialny* ‘ministerial’, or *urzędniczy* ‘clerk.ADJ’, resemble possessive pronouns in functioning as elements which can satisfy the argument structure of event nominals. The focus is laid on intransitive nominals, in view of the Possessor Principle proposed for Polish by Rozwadowska (1997). While some Polish intransitive nominals accompanied by possessives or by group adjectives are recognized as referential nominals (as is predicted by the analysis of Greek and Romanian group adjectives presented by Alexiadou and Stavrou, 2011, and Moreno, 2015), other intransitive nominals with such adjectival satellites are argued to be argument-supporting nominals. The association with the agentive reading (i.e., external argument interpretation) is shown to be characteristic, but not obligatory, with thematic group adjectives.

**Keywords:** derived nominals, argument-supporting nominals, thematic group adjectives, possessive adjectives

### 1 Introduction

This article investigates the usage of pronominal possessive adjectives and thematic group adjectives in intransitive Polish nominals.

Lexical possessive adjectives in Slavonic languages are denominal adjectives derived from kinship terms, titles, names of professions and given names by means of the suffix *-in* or *-ov*, as is shown for Russian by Babyonyshev (1997) and for all Slavonic languages by Corbett (1987). In present-day Polish possessive *-in* or *-ow* adjectives are used mainly as an indication of a non-standard (rural) dialect,<sup>1</sup> e.g., *kuźnia Michałowa* ‘Michał’s smithy’, *grób Wojciechowy* ‘Wojciech’s grave’, *Zosina krzywda* ‘Zosia’s harm, i.e., harm to Zosia’, *Hanczyna dusza* ‘Hanka’s soul’.

Group adjectives are relational adjectives derived from nouns denoting professions, countries, or titles (see Grimshaw, 1990, for English group adjectives, Marchis, 2010, for Romanian and Spanish ones). They can be derived in Polish by means of various suffixes (see Kallas, 1984; Szymanek, 2010), including *-ski/-cki*, *-owy*, *-ny*, as in *lekarski* ‘physician.ADJ’, *studencki* ‘student.ADJ’, *wojskowy* ‘military’, and *parlamentarny* ‘parliamentary’. Some denominal

---

<sup>1</sup> Lexical possessive adjectives, in particular those formed from kinship terms, can also be used in colloquial spoken Polish, as shown by the following example from the NKJP corpus: *Kuba zajął się rozwalaniem Basinych zabawek* ‘Kuba was busy smashing Basia’s toys’. Alternatively, the usage of such adjectives may be a means of archaization, e.g., *Jakby nasze chabry Zosine oczęta* ‘Zosia’s eyes, like our cornflowers’ (NKJP).

adjectives contain the zero suffix  $-\emptyset$ , i.e., the paradigmatic formative, e.g., *robotniczy* ‘worker.ADJ’, *urzędniczy* ‘clerk.ADJ’.

Possessive (genitival) adjectives in Slavonic languages show noun-like behaviour. In Upper Sorbian they can control relative pronouns, act as antecedents for personal pronouns and for reflexive possessives. Thus, they are regarded by some researchers as parts of the nominal paradigm, i.e., as inflectional forms of nouns (see Corbett, 1987 and Spencer 2013, p. 379).

It will be argued in this paper that relational group adjectives in Polish can be treated as saturating theta-roles of event nominals. Section 2 argues that the split of denominal adjectives into relational adjectives and possessive (genitival) adjectives is not so sharp in Polish as in other Slavonic languages. Section 3 examines the occurrence of thematic adjectives in intransitive nominals and in syntactically transitive single-participant nominals derived from psychological predicates. Section 4 considers the question whether Polish event nominals containing thematic group adjectives can be regarded as argument-supporting nominals.

## 2 Possessive adjectives vs. relational group adjectives

Trugman (2004, p. 82), following Babyonyshev (1997), mentions the following differences between possessive (genitival) adjectives and relational adjectives in Russian.

- (1) “ a. Possessives are individual-denoting elements, whereas referential adjectives are property-denoting.
- b. Possessives are referential elements, while adjectives are non-referential (...) hence only the former can act as antecedents of pronouns and reflexives.
- c. Possessives can bear theta-roles, while adjectives cannot.” (Trugman 2004, p. 82)

When discussing Russian relational adjectives such as *roditel'skij* ‘parental’, *ženskij* ‘woman.ADJ’ and *sosedskij* ‘neighbour.ADJ’, Trugman (2004, pp. 82-83) argues that they are non-referential and that they specify a property or a type of an entity. She observes that the Russian phrase *ženskaja sumočka* (lit. ‘woman.ADJ handbag’) denotes a type of a handbag, i.e., a woman’s handbag. It does not refer to a specific unique woman who would be the owner of the handbag. Due to their non-referentiality, relational adjectives (RAs) in Russian cannot act as antecedents for the reflexive pronoun *svoix* ‘self’s’, as is shown for the adjective *sosedskij* ‘neighbour.ADJ’ in (2b). They differ in this respect from possessive *-in/-ov* adjectives (PAs), such as *sosedkin* ‘neighbour.PA’ in (2a).

- (2) a. *sosedskin<sub>i</sub>*      *rasskaz*      *o*      *svoix<sub>i</sub>*      *problem<sub>ax</sub>*  
          neighbour.PA    story            about   self’s    problems  
          ‘[my] neighbour’s story about her problems’
- b. *sosedskij<sub>i</sub>*      *rasskaz*      *o*      *svoix<sub>j/\*i</sub>*      *problem<sub>ax</sub>*  
          neighbor.RA    story            about   self’s    problems  
          ‘a story about one’s problems, typical of neighbours’  
          (Babyonyshev, 1997, p. 203, ex. (16))

It can be shown that the generalization (concerning the differences between relational and possessive adjectives) proposed for Russian does not hold for Polish. Relational adjectives do not need to be property-denoting in Polish. The group adjectives in (3) have an argumental (or

argument-like) behaviour. They call for an agentive interpretation, thus they can be regarded as bearing the theta-role of Agent.

- (3) a. *żołnierskie wizyty*  
 soldier.ADJ visits  
 ‘visits by soldiers’
- b. *profesorskie debaty*  
 professorial debates  
 ‘professorial debates, debates by professors’
- c. *papieskie podróże*  
 papal journeys  
 ‘papal journeys’
- d. *urzędnicze spory*  
 clerical disputes  
 ‘clerical workers’ disputes’

Relational adjectives occurring in (3) show the default mass/unbounded reading (Moreno, 2015), i.e., they imply some indefinite group of soldiers, professors, popes, or clerks. This is not the only possible reading of group adjectives, though. The relational adjectives in (4) can be interpreted as having definite specific reference, pointing to a particular president, pope or prince.<sup>2</sup>

- (4) a. *to prezydencka porażka, o której prezydent*  
 this presidential defeat.NOM about which president.NOM  
*w comiesięcznym bilansie „zapomniał” wspomnieć*  
 in monthly balance forgot.3SG mention.INF  
 ‘This is a presidential defeat which the president “forgot” to mention in his monthly balance.’
- b. *przedostatnia wizyta papieska w kraju rodzinnym*  
 penultimate visit.NOM papal in country family.ADJ  
 ‘the penultimate visit by the pope in (his) homeland’
- c. *w przychylnej atmosferze książęca narzeczona mogła*  
 in favourable atmosphere princely fiancée.NOM could.3SG.F  
*poznać język, obyczaje i najbardziej wpływowych*  
 learn.INF language.ACC customs.ACC and most influential  
*mieszkańców kraju jej przyszłego męża*  
 inhabitants.ACC country.GEN her future husband.GEN  
 ‘(...) in a friendly atmosphere, the prince’s fiancée could learn the language, customs and the most influential inhabitants of her future husband’s country.’
- d. *Prezydencka córka spodziewa się też dziecka.*  
 presidential daughter.NOM expect.3SG REFL also child.GEN  
 ‘The president’s daughter is also expecting a baby.’

The difference between relational group adjectives and lexical possessive adjectives is blurred in Polish. It is common among Polish morphologists to neglect the distinction between *-in/-ow* adjectives and other types of denominal adjectives. Grzegorzczkowska (1982,

<sup>2</sup> The sentences in (4) come from the National Corpus of Polish (see <http://www.nkjp.pl>).

p. 68) mentions adjectives terminating in the suffixes *-in(y)*, *-ow(y)*, *-sk(i)/-ck(i)*, *-ø*, as examples of possessive adjectives. A similar position is taken by Nagórko (1987, p. 145), who regards the following noun+adjective strings as examples of the possessive construction, although only the first of them contains the genitival adjective (i.e., *matczyny* ‘mother.PA’): *matczyna chustka* (lit. ‘mother.ADJ kerchief’) ‘mother’s kerchief’, *dom ojcowski* (lit. ‘house father.ADJ’) ‘father’s house’, *skarbiec sultański* (lit. ‘treasury sultan.ADJ’) ‘sultan’s treasury’ and *fundusze zakładowe* (lit. ‘funds company.ADJ’) ‘the company’s funds’. Szymanek (2010, pp. 92-87) treats the possessive function as one of the possible meanings of relational adjectives in Polish.

### 3 Possessives and group adjectives in Polish single-participant derived nominals

When discussing the argument realization in intransitive nominals in Polish, Rozwadowska (1997) shows that the single argument cannot be expressed by an agentive adjunct *przez+PP* ‘by PP’, as is the case with the external argument of the transitive nominal in (5a).

- (5) a. *pobicie studentów przez policjantów*  
 beating.NOM students.GEN by policemen.ACC  
 ‘the beating of (the) students by (the) policemen’
- b. *\*pobicie studentów policjantów*  
 beating.NOM students.GEN policemen.GEN  
 Intended reading: ‘the beating of (the) students by (the) policemen’

In intransitive nominals, as illustrated in (6) and (7) below, a possessive pronoun or an adnominal genitive must be employed as a syntactic realization of the single argument.

- (6) a. *twój płacz*  
 your cry.NOM  
 ‘your cry’
- b. *płacz dziecka*  
 cry.NOM child.GEN  
 ‘the/a child’s cry’
- c. *\*płacz ciebie*  
 cry.NOM you.GEN  
 Intended reading: ‘your cry’
- d. *\*płacz przez ciebie*  
 cry.NOM by you.ACC  
 Intended reading: ‘the/a cry by you’
- e. *\*płacz przez dziecko*  
 cry.NOM by child.ACC  
 Intended reading: ‘the/a cry by the/a child’
- (7) a. *twoje bieganie po parku*  
 your.SG running.NOM around park.LOC  
 ‘your running around the park’

- b. *bieganie* *dzieci* *po* *parku*  
 running.NOM children.GEN around park.LOC  
 ‘children’s running around the park’
- c. *\*bieganie* *przez* *ciebie* *po* *parku*  
 running.NOM by you.ACC around park.LOC  
 Intended reading: ‘your running around the park’
- d. *\*bieganie* *przez* *dzieci* *po* *parku*  
 running.NOM by children.ACC around park.LOC  
 ‘children’s running around the park’

Let us observe that the adnominal genitive or the possessive pronoun in (6) and (7) can be replaced by a group adjective, as in (8).<sup>3</sup>

- (8) a. *aby* *Kronos* *nie* *słyszał* *dziecięcego* *placzu*  
 so\_that Cronus.NOM not heard.3SG child.ADJ cry.GEN  
 ‘so that Cronus couldn’t hear a child crying’
- b. *wtorkowe* *studenckie* *bieganie*  
 Tuesday.ADJ student.ADJ running.NOM  
 ‘Tuesday student jogging’

The group adjectives in (8) are thematic (Bosque and Picallo, 1996), i.e., they can be treated as saturating the theta-role of agent.

A classificatory (i.e., non-thematic) usage of group adjectives is illustrated in (9). The adjectives *dziecięcy* ‘child.ADJ’ and *studencki* ‘student.ADJ’ are interpreted in (9) as denoting types of crying and types of running (jogging), since there are other syntactic realizations of the external argument in the sentences in question, i.e., the possessive pronoun *jego* ‘his’ in (9a) and *mój* ‘my’ in (9b).

- (9) a. *Kontuzje* *przerwały* *jego* *studenckie* *bieganie*.  
 injuries.NOM stopped.PL his student.ADJ running.ACC  
 ‘Injuries halted his student jogging.’
- b. *Mój* *rozpaczliwy* *dziecięcy* *placz* *nie* *przeszkadzał* *im*.  
 my piteous child.ADJ cry.NOM not bothered.3SG them.DAT  
 ‘My piteous childish crying did not bother them.’

Another illustration of the contrast between the thematic and the classificatory usage of a relational adjective is provided in (10). The presence of the adnominal genitive forces the classificatory reading of the adjective *prezydencki* ‘presidential’ in (10b).

- (10) a. *Prezydencka* *wizyta* *do* *ostatniej* *chwili* *okryta*  
 presidential visit.NOM until last moment.GEN covered.PPART  
*była* *największą* *tajemnicą*  
 was.3SG greatest mystery.INS  
 ‘The president’s visit remained a secret until the last moment.’

<sup>3</sup> The examples in (8)-(12) are culled from the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP).

- b. *dogłębnie* *przeanalizować* *zasadność* *prezydenckiej*  
 profoundly analyse.INF reasonableness.ACC presidential  
*wizyty* *Lecha* *Kaczyńskiego* *w* *Gruzji*  
 visit.GEN Lech.GEN Kaczyński.GEN in Georgia  
 ‘to analyse profoundly the justifiedness of Lech Kaczyński’s presidential visit in Georgia’

The thematic role attributable to the adjective *prezydencki* ‘presidential’ in (10a) is that of the Agent, as in the case of *dziecięcy* ‘child.ADJ’ in (8a) and *studencki* ‘student.ADJ’ in (8b). The same is true of the relational group adjectives which accompany the nominalisations of the unergative verbs in (11).

- (11) a. *Rumunia: trwa* *robotniczy* *protest* *w* *Bukareszcie*.  
 Romania continues.3SG worker.ADJ protest.NOM in Bucharest  
 ‘Romania: a workers’ protest continues in Bucharest.’  
 b. *W korytarzu* *Kancelarii* *Sejmu* *królowało*  
 in corridor.LOC Chancellery.GEN Sejm.GEN reigned.3SG  
*urzędnicze* *“gorączkowe dreptanie”*.  
 clerical feverish pattering.NOM  
 ‘In the corridor of the Chancellery of the Polish parliament there reigned the clerical “frantic pattering”.’

The agentive reading of relational adjectives is recognized as obligatory for thematic adjectives in English by Kayne (1984, p. 139), who notes the difference between the acceptability of the phrase *the Russian (Agent) bombardment of Iran* and the ill-formedness of *\*the Iranian (Theme) bombardment by Russia*. With respect to Spanish, Bosque and Picallo (1996, p. 355) and Brito (2008, p. 16) notice the ungrammaticality of relational adjectives assigned the Patient/Theme role in nominalisations of unaccusative verbs, such as *\*la salida real del palacio* ‘the royal leaving from the palace’, and *\*la desaparición yugoslava del mapa político mundial* ‘the Yugoslav disappearance from the political map’. A similar observation is made by Alexiadou and Stavrou (2011), who point to the ill-formedness of group adjectives in English nominalisations derived from unaccusative verbs, such as *\*the Austro-Hungarian disappearance from the political scene*.

Let us, however, consider the Polish intransitive nominals in (12), which are derived from unaccusative verbs, such as *powrócić* ‘to return.PFV’, *przyjechać* ‘to arrive.PFV’, *odjechać* ‘to leave.PFV’, *umierać* ‘to die.IPFV’. The relational adjectives in (12) carry the Patient/Theme role.

- (12) a. *dni* *papieskiego* *umierania*  
 days.NOM papal dying.IPFV.GEN  
 ‘the days of the pope’s dying’  
 b. *optymistyczne* *prognozy* *papieskiego* *powrotu* *do* *zdrowia*  
 optimistic forecasts.NOM papal return.GEN to health.GEN  
 ‘optimistic forecasts of Pope’s recovery’  
 c. *urzędnicze* *wyjście* *na* *papierosa*  
 clerical leaving.NOM for cigarette  
 ‘an office worker’s going out for a cigarette’

- d. *Królewski przyjazd i odjazd był odtrąbiony*  
 royal arrival.NOM and leaving.NOM was.3SG trumpeted.PPART  
*z wieży mariackiej.*  
 from tower Mary.ADJ  
 ‘A trumpet was blown from the tower of St. Mary’s Basilica to signal the royal coming and leaving.’

The possibility of expressing the Patient/Theme argument by relational adjectives follows indirectly from the Possessor Principle, proposed on the basis of Polish by Rozwadowska (1997) and interpreted as valid cross-linguistically by Rozwadowska (2006).

- (13) “Possessive phrase can accommodate only a single event participant.” (Rozwadowska 1997, p. 55)

Single participants of unaccusative verbs can be realized syntactically by possessive pronouns and by adnominal genitives, as is shown in (14).

- (14) a. *powrót papieża do zdrowia*  
 return pope.GEN to health  
 ‘Pope’s recovery’  
 b. *jego powrót do zdrowia*  
 his return to health  
 ‘his recovery’  
 c. *umieranie papieża*  
 dying.IPFV.NOM pope.GEN  
 ‘Pope’s dying’  
 d. *jego umieranie*  
 his dying.IPFV.NOM  
 ‘his dying’

If relational group adjectives are able to replace possessive adjectives in Polish, they are expected to occur in nominals derived from unaccusative verbs, as shown in (12).

Rozwadowska (1997, p. 100) argues that some transitive verbs should be treated as denoting single-participant events. She postulates that syntactically transitive “psych-eventualities”, such as *interesować* ‘to interest’, *zaskoczyć* ‘surprise’, *przerazić* ‘frighten’, are intransitive at the level of event structure. Consequently, the Experiencer argument, which is treated by Rozwadowska (1997, 2006) as a single participant of such eventualities, is syntactically realized as a possessive adjective (i.e., possessive pronoun) or an adnominal genitive.

- (15) a. *Marek zaskoczył nas wszystkich nagłym płaczem.*  
 Marek.NOM surprised.3SG us.ACC all.ACC sudden cry.INS  
 ‘Mark surprised us all with his sudden cry.’  
 b. *\*zaskoczenie nas wszystkich nagłym płaczem*  
 surprising.nom us.GEN all.GEN sudden cry.INS  
*przez Marka*  
 by Marek.ACC  
 Intended meaning: ‘our surprise at Mark’s sudden cry’



- c. \**zaskoczenie nas wszystkich nagłym płaczem Marka*  
 surprising.nom us.GEN all.GEN sudden cry.INS Marek.GEN  
 Intended meaning: ‘our surprise at Mark’s sudden cry’
- d. *nasze zaskoczenie nagłym płaczem Marka*  
 our surprise.NOM sudden cry.INS Marek.GEN  
 ‘our surprise at Mark’s sudden cry’ (Rozwadowska 1997, p. 101, ex. (1a)-(1d))

The examples in (16), either culled from the National Corpus of Polish or found during Google searches, indicate that the single participant of Experiencer verbs can be expressed by relational group adjectives.

- (16) a. *Poselskie oburzenie bierze się stąd*  
 parliamentary indignation.NOM comes.3SG REFL from.here  
 ‘The indignation of PMs is due to this (...)’ [NKJP]
- b. *dziecięce przerażenie, łatwość frustrowania się*  
 child.ADJ terror.NOM ease.NOM frustrating.GEN REFL  
 ‘a child’s terror, the ability to get frustrated easily’  
[http://www.taraka.pl/pierwszy\\_impuls](http://www.taraka.pl/pierwszy_impuls)
- c. *prawdziwe kobiece zmęczenie codziennością*  
 real female tiredness.NOM ordinariness.INS  
 ‘real women’s tiredness with every-day reality’  
<http://www.polityka.pl/tygodnikpolityka/kultura/1619597,1,kawiarnia-literacka.read>
- d. *Na urzędnicze zdziwienie raczej nie ma rady –*  
 on clerical surprise.ACC rather not have.3SG.N advice.GEN  
*trzeba uzbroić się w cierpliwość i powtarzać (...)*  
 one.should equip.INF REFL with patience.ACC and repeat.INF  
 ‘There’s nothing to be done about clerks (or civil servants) showing their surprise, you have to be patient and repeat.’  
[http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/wiadomosci/1,114871,14402273,Pawlowska\\_Wyszl\\_am\\_za\\_maz\\_zostawilam\\_nazwisko\\_panienskie\\_.html](http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/wiadomosci/1,114871,14402273,Pawlowska_Wyszl_am_za_maz_zostawilam_nazwisko_panienskie_.html)

The next section will consider the issue whether Polish nominals modified by thematic adjectives show event or result reading and whether they can be regarded as names of complex events.

#### 4 Thematic adjectives with referential or with argument-supporting nominals

In the case of thematic group adjectives accompanying single-participant nominals, the question could be asked whether such adjectives are arguments or modifiers.<sup>4</sup> Grimshaw (1990) and Alexiadou and Grimshaw (2008), among others, draw the distinction between argument-supporting nominals (called “complex event nominals” by Grimshaw, 1990) and referential nominals, which have no argument structure. Referential nominals often denote objects (e.g., results of a process) or are names of simple events.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, McNally and Boleda (2004) argue that relational adjectives cannot express arguments and can only have the status of modifiers.

Alexiadou and Stavrou (2011), when discussing Greek ethnic adjectives, which constitute a subgroup of relational adjectives, argue that relational adjectives cannot modify argument-supporting nominals. The same position is taken by Moreno (2015), who discusses relational adjectives in Romanian and finds them to be unacceptable with complex event nominals.

The Polish nominals in (17) can be regarded as names of results, e.g., *wypowiedź* ‘utterance, i.e., what has been uttered’, *zakaz* ‘ban; what has been banned’, *podpis* ‘signature’.

- (17) a. *papieski zakaz* ‘papal ban’  
 b. *profesorska wypowiedź* ‘professorial utterance’, i.e., ‘the professor’s utterance’  
 c. *prezydencki podpis* ‘presidential signature’  
 d. *prokuratorski nakaz* ‘prosecutor’s warrant’  
 e. *górnice żądania* ‘miners’ demands’

The nouns in (18) denote events, as they can be followed by verbs such as *trwać* ‘to continue, to last’. However, they can be regarded as names of simple events. They have no verbal bases (since they are borrowings), so they lack underlying verbal projections.

- (18) a. *czat prezydencki* ‘presidential chat’  
 b. *prokuratorski blamaż* ‘prosecutors’ disgracing themselves’  
 c. *prezydencki konflikt* ‘presidential conflict’  
 d. *urzędniczy ping-pong* ‘clerical ping-pong’

Let us now consider event nouns which have corresponding verbal bases. In the case of Polish derived nominals, there is a split between deverbal nominals and verbal nominals (see Puzynina, 1969; Rozwadowska, 1997; Bloch-Trojnar, 2013). Verbal nominals are headed by gerundive nouns terminating in the suffix *-nie/-cie*. Deverbal nominals are headed by deverbal nouns (“substantiva deverbalia”) which terminate in other (less productive) overt nominalizing suffixes or in a zero suffix. The noun phrases in (19) are headed by deverbal event nouns, while those in (20) by verbal nouns.

- (19) a. *dyrektorska narada* ‘managerial meeting’  
 b. *robotniczy protest* ‘workers’ protest’  
 c. *papieski przyjazd* ‘papal arrival’  
 d. *królewski ożenek* ‘royal marriage’  
 e. *prezydencki skok przez płot* ‘presidential jump over the fence’  
 f. *policyjna walka z marihuaną* ‘police battle against marijuana’  
 g. *policyjna przejażdżka czołgiem* ‘police ride in a tank’  
 (20) a. *urzędnicze głędzenie* ‘white-collar workers’ prattle’  
 b. *poselskie narzekanie na media* ‘PM’s complaining about the mass media’  
 c. *poselskie oszczędzanie* ‘parliamentary thrift’  
 d. *całe to urzędnicze majstrowanie przy działalności człowieka*  
 all this clerical tinkering.NOM with activity.LOC man.GEN  
 ‘all this clerical tinkering with human activity’ [NKJP]

Deverbal nominals in (19) can be pluralized, as is shown in (21).

- (21) a. *dyrektorskie narady* ‘managerial meetings’  
 b. *robotnicze protesty* ‘workers’ protests’  
 c. *papieskie przyjazdy* ‘papal arrivals’  
 d. *królewskie ożenki* ‘royal marriages’  
 e. *prezydenckie skoki przez płot* ‘presidential jumps over the fence’  
 f. *policyjne walki* ‘police battles’  
 g. *policyjne przejażdżki czołgiem* ‘police rides in a tank’

According to Grimshaw (1990) and Alexiadou and Grimshaw (2008), complex event nominals must be uncountable. However, Alexiadou, Iordachioaia and Soare (2010) argue that argument-supporting nominals can pluralize if they contribute bounded events. Such a position can be taken with respect to the event nominals listed in (21).

As is demonstrated by Rozwadowska (1997) and Bloch-Trojnar (2013), both nominals headed by verbal and deverbal nouns can have the status of argument-supporting event nominals (i.e., complex event nominals) if they exhibit the appropriate verb-like behaviour. When they are transitive argument-taking nominalisations, they can occur with internal arguments and agentive adjuncts, e.g., *kradzież samochodu przez podejrzanego* ‘the theft of a/the car by the suspect’.

For intransitive deverbal nominals it is more difficult to show that they are argument-supporting nominals. They can occur with nominal complements in the oblique case (or with prepositional complements), e.g., *walka z marihuaną* ‘battle against marijuana’ in (19f), *przejażdżka czołgiem* ‘a ride in a tank’ in (19g), or *narzekańie na media* ‘complaining about the mass media’ in (20b). However, Grimshaw (1990) regards such (optional) complements as projected on the basis of the lexical conceptual structure (and not argument structure) of corresponding verbs.

Nominalisations of unaccusative verbs are more obvious candidates for argument-taking nominals since they occur with internal arguments, e.g., *papieskie umieranie* ‘papal dying’ and other nominals in (12).

Intransitive verbal nominals with thematic adjectives can be identified as argument-supporting ones when they exhibit verbal characteristics, such as the presence of aspectual markers, the occurrence with adverbial modifiers and aspectual modifiers, the ability to occur with the reflexive clitic, and negation by the particle *nie*- (see Bloch-Trojnar, 2013, pp. 192–202). Such examples are unattested or rare in the National Corpus of Polish, yet they can either be constructed (e.g., by modifying sentences from the NKJP corpus) or found via Google searches. The nominals in (22) contain aspectual temporal adverbials, as is expected of names of complex events.

- (22) a. *papieskie umieranie przez wiele tygodni*  
 papal dying.IPFV.NOM for many weeks  
 ‘the pope’s dying for many weeks’  
 b. *królewski przyjazd za dwa dni*  
 royal arrival.NOM in two days  
 ‘the king’s arrival in two days’

- c.    *robotnicze protesty*                      *przez*            *ostatnie*            *pół*    *roku*  
       worker.adj protests.NOM            for            last            half    year.GEN  
       ‘workers’ protests for the past half a year’

The presence of the reflexive clitic and the negative particle in intransitive verbal nominals (with thematic adjectives) is illustrated in (23).

- (23) a.    *poselskie*                      *niereagowanie*                      *na*    *potrzeby*            *wyborców*  
           parliamentary    not.reactng.IPFV.NOM    on    needs.ACC            voters.GEN  
           ‘MPs not reacting to voters’ needs’
- b.    *papieskie*    *nieangażowanie*                      *się*    *w*            *konflikty*            *polityczne*  
           papal            not.involving.IPFV.NOM            REFL    in            conflicts.ACC    political  
           ‘the pope’s not getting involved into political conflicts’
- c.    *prezydenckie*    *plątanie*                      *się*    *w*            *zeznaniach*  
           presidential    confusing.IPFV.NOM            REFL    in            testimonies.LOC  
           ‘the president’s giving inconsistent statements’
- d.    *prezydenckie*    *zaplątanie*                      *się*    *w*            *zeznaniach*  
           presidential    confusing.PFV.NOM            REFL    in            testimonies.LOC  
           ‘the president’s having given inconsistent statements’

The verbal nouns occurring in (23a-c) contain markers of the imperfective grammatical aspect, whereas the verbal noun in (23d) is derived from a perfective verb. The verbal nouns *plątanie się* ‘getting confused’ and *zaplątanie się* ‘having become confused’ form an aspectual pair, which can be regarded as an indication of their status as argument-supporting nominals.

## 5 Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to consider the occurrence of relational group adjectives as thematic satellites in event nominals in Polish.

It was argued that Polish group adjectives behave in some respects like possessive pronouns, since they can function as syntactic realizations of single-participants in intransitive event nominals derived from unergative verbs, such as *dyrektorska narada* ‘managerial meeting’, *studentkie bieganie* ‘student jogging’, or nominals derived from unaccusative verbs, e.g. *papieskie umieranie* ‘papal dying’, *królewski przyjazd* ‘royal arrival’. Furthermore, group adjectives can appear as the syntactic expression of the single participant of syntactically transitive psych-eventualities, such as *urzędnicze zdziwienie* ‘clerical surprise’, or *poselskie oburzenie* ‘parliamentary indignation’.

Consequently, while the most common theta-role associated with group adjectives in Polish is the role of Agent (as observed for English by Kayne, 1984, or for Greek by Alexiadou and Stavrou, 2011), such adjectives can also carry the role of Theme/Patient (in unaccusative nominals) or the role of Experiencer (in nominalisations of psychological predicates).

Some of the data discussed in this paper seem to confirm the observation that thematic adjectives are expected to occur with referential nominals (as argued by Alexiadou and Stavrou, 2011, and Moreno, 2015). Such adjectives often accompany result nouns and names of simple events.

However, it cannot be claimed that Polish group adjectives are illicit with names of complex events. Polish event nominals, in particular those which are headed by *-nie/-cie* nominals, exhibit properties of argument-supporting nominals. Even when accompanied by thematic group adjectives, such event nominals show aspectual contrasts, can occur with the reflexive clitic *się* and with the negative particle *nie-*.

## References

- Alexiadou, A. and Grimshaw, J. (2008). Verbs, nouns and affixation. *SINSPEC (Working Papers of the SFB 732)*, 1, 1-16.
- Alexiadou, A., Iordachioaia, G., and Soare, E. (2010). Number/Aspect interactions in the syntax of nominalizations: A Distributed Morphology approach. *Journal of Linguistics*, 46, 537-574.
- Alexiadou, A. and Stavrou, M. (2011). Ethnic adjectives as pseudo-adjectives: A case study in syntax-morphology interaction and the structure of DP. *Studia Linguistica*, 65(2), 117-146.
- Babyonyshev, M. (1997). The possessive construction in Russian: A crosslinguistic perspective. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 5(2), 193-233.
- Bloch-Trojnar, M. (2013). *The mechanics of transposition. A study of action nominalisations in English, Irish and Polish*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL
- Bosque, I. and Picallo, C. (1996). Postnominal adjectives in Spanish DPs. *Journal of Linguistics*, 32, 349-385.
- Brito, A. M. (2008). Thematic adjectives with process unaccusative nominals and grammar variation. *Cuadernos de Lingüística*, 15, 13-32.
- Corbett, G. (1987). The morphology/syntax interface: Evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. *Language*, 63(2), 299-344.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grzegorzczkova, R. (1982). *Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego. Słowotwórstwo opisowe* (5th edition). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kayne, R. (1984). *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kallas, K. (1984). Słowotwórstwo przymiotników. In R. Grzegorzczkova, R. Laskowski, and H. Wróbel (Eds.), *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* (pp. 408-455). Warszawa: PWN.
- Marchis, M. (2010). *Relational adjectives at the syntax-morphology interface in Romanian and Spanish*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart.
- McNally, L. and Boleda, G. (2004). Relational adjectives as properties of kinds. In O. Bonami and P. Cabredo-Hofherr (Eds.), *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics 5* (pp. 179-196). Bern: Peter Lang Publishers. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss5>.
- Moreno, M. M. (2015). Relational adjectives at interfaces. *Studia Linguistica*, 69(3), 304-332.
- Nagórko, A. (1987). *Zagadnienia derywacji przymiotników*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

- Puzynina, J. (1969). *Nazwy czynności w języku polskim*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Rozwadowska, B. (1997). *Towards a unified theory of nominalizations. External and internal eventualities*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Rozwadowska, B. (2006). Derived nominals. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax, vol. II* (pp. 24-55). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Spencer, A. (2013). *Lexical relatedness: A paradigm-based model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szymanek, B. (2010). *A panorama of Polish word-formation*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Trugman, H. (2004). *Syntax of Russian DPs, and DP-internal agreement phenomena*. (Doctoral dissertation). Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv.

Bożena Cetnarowska  
University of Silesia  
Institute of English  
ul. Gen. Stefana Grot-Roweckiego 5  
41-205 Sosnowiec, Poland  
e-mail: [cetnarow@gmail.com](mailto:cetnarow@gmail.com)